

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 14 and 15; claim 16 has been canceled. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-15 and 17-21 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claims 14-16 on the asserted basis that those claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 14 and 15 were amended to address the rejection. Claim 16 has been canceled, thereby rendering its rejection moot.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

A. Claims 1, 2, and 4-7, and 9-20

Claims 1-2, and 4-7, and 9-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kundorf, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,217) in view of Rodrigo, *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0074286). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The examiner concedes that Kundorf does not explicitly show "during the traversing detecting one or more notification requests for intermediate conditions". In order to cure the Examiner's perceived deficiencies of Kundorf, Rodrigo is cited. The Examiner argues that Rodrigo discloses Advice of Charge which can be configured into business rules and managed by a bridge.

Rodrigo teaches using rules for correlating charging events (i.e. the function of a well known mediation device/charging gateway). However, Rodrigo like Kundorf also does not disclose the traversing of a tariff structure and during the traversing detecting notification requests (also called notification triggers). Rodrigo relates to the correlation/consolidation of charging events. Rodrigo's Advice of Charge allows customer's to query the approximate charge for a call or service. The present Application discloses traversing a tariff structure in response after a service is requested. Rodrigo discloses that the customer directly queries the approximate charge

for a call or service. As such, the traversing and detecting steps of Applicant's claims is not contemplated by Rodrigo. Thus, neither Kundorf nor Rodrigo teaches "during the traversing, detecting one or more notification requests for intermediate conditions".

In view of the above arguments, independent claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Kundorf and Rodrigo. Claims 2, 4-7, and 9-20 are patentable at least by virtue of depending from their respective base claim.

B. Claim 8

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kundorf, *et al.* in view of Rodrigo, *et al.* and further in view of Ear (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0009500). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner concedes that the combination of Kundorf and Rodrigo fails to teach "wherein all conditions fulfilled during traversal is output as a log, wherein said log is processed in a subsequent step by a separate process to analyse the performed rating and produce corresponding one or more notifications". (See Office Action Section 4) In order to cure the Examiner's perceived deficiency, Ear is cited.

As argued above in Section 3.) A., the combination of Kundorf and Rodrigo fails to teach "during the traversing, detecting one or more notification requests for intermediate conditions". Ear also fails to cure this deficiency. As such, claim 8 is patentable over the combination of Kundorf, Rodrigo, and Ear.

C. Claim 21

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kundorf, *et al.* in view of Rodrigo, *et al.* and further in view of Chan (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0003736). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner concedes that the combination of Kundorf and Rodrigo fails to "explicitly show the service is an electronic commerce/payment service". (See Office Action Section 5) In order to cure the Examiner's perceived deficiency, Chan is cited.

As argued above in Section 3.) A., the combination of Kundorf and Rodrigo fails to teach "during the traversing, detecting one or more notification requests for

intermediate conditions". Chan also fails to cure this deficiency. As such, claim 8 is patentable over the combination of Kundorf, Rodrigo, and Chan.

4.) Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant notes with appreciation the conditional allowance of claim 3. However, Applicant implores the Examiner to consider the allowability of remaining claims 1, 2, 4-15, and 17-21 in light of the above arguments.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas Bethea, Jr., Reg#53987/

Thomas Bethea, Jr
Registration No. 53,987

Date: June 8, 2010

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4859
thomas.bethea.jr@ericsson.com